



ERIC GIBSON
DIRECTOR

County of San Diego

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND LAND USE

5201 RUFFIN ROAD, SUITE B, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1666
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dplu

October 29, 2009

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form **(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G Rev. 10/04)**

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Settlers Point; 3100 5423; 3600 05-004; 3910 05-14-009

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B,
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

3. a. Contact Larry Hofreiter, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-8846
c. E-mail: larry.hofreiter@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project site is located along the north side of Highway I-8, approximately 550 feet south of the Los Coches Road intersection, in the unincorporated community of Lakeside within the County of San Diego. The development of the site affects Assessor Parcel Numbers 397-210-17, 397-212-01, 397-291-02, 397-291-15 through 17.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1232, Grid C/7

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Thomas Odom
1440 West Renwick Road
San Dimas, CA 91733

6. General Plan Designation

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Community Plan: | Lakeside |
| Land Use Designation: | 5; Residential (4.3 du/acre) |
| Land Use Designation | 8; Residential (14.5 du/acre) |

7. Zoning
- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Use Regulation: | RS4 |
| Minimum Lot Size: | 10,000 S.F. |
| Building Type: | C (Single Family Detached) |
| Height: | G (35 ft. 2 stories) |
| Setback: | H |

8. Description of project:

The project is a residential subdivision for multi-family housing proposing no more than 266 units on 21.89 acres. The project is located off Old Highway 80 approximately 550 feet west of the Los Coches Road / Highway 80 intersection within the Lakeside Community Planning Area within the unincorporated area of San Diego County. The project includes a tentative map for four residential lots and one street lot and a zone reclassification to rezone 19.64 acres. The residential lot sizes range in size from 7.19 acres to 4.72 acres. The tentative map would restrict future development to no more than 266 units. The site is subject to the General Plan Regional Category Current Urban Development Area (CUDA), Land Use Designation (8) Residential (14.5 du/acre) on 19.64 acres of the project site and (5) Residential (4.3 du/acre) on the remaining 2.25 acres of the project site.

Current zoning for the entire project site is RS4 with 10,000 square feet minimum lot size. The rezone proposes RV-14.5 Zoning on 19.64 acres of the project site, but maintains the RS-4 zoning on 2.25 acres in the north. The RV-14.5 Zone will specify "A" Animal Regulations, "K" Building Type, "G" Height and "H" Setbacks. The RV-14.5 Zone will not specify a minimum lot size. This rezone will allow up to 266 dwelling units to be developed on the site with a density of 14.5 du's/acre on each of the proposed lots. The rezone would include a "B" designator that would require a subsequent site plan to be reviewed for consistency with the Lakeside Design Guidelines for any future development

The project will take access from Highway 8 Business loop that will connect to Wellington Hill Drive in the north.

The following intersection configuration is proposed at the project driveway (Street "A") at Highway 8 Business Loop:

- Southbound – one exclusive left-turn lane and one exclusive right-turn lane.
- Eastbound – one left-turn lane and one thru lane.
- Westbound – one right-turn lane and thru lane.

- Ensure County sight distance standards are met at the intersection with Highway 8 Business Loop.

The proposed project would include a 10 foot wide pathway along the west side of Street "A" composed of decomposed granite.

Sewer service will be provided by the Lakeside Sanitation District and water will be provided by Helix Water District. The entire project site is proposed to be impacted by the development from construction of flat pads, slopes, retaining walls, access roads and stormwater and drainage improvements. Grading will consist of 218,000 cubic yards of cut and fill material. All slopes will be treated with hydroseed as part of the projects' erosion control Best Management Practices (BMPs). The project also includes off-site impacts due to fire clearing, frontage improvements along Highway 8 Business Loop, utility lines, and drainage structures.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The proposed project is bordered on the southeast by Old Highway 80 also known as the I-8 Business Loop (Service Commercial). Single-family residences are located to the east and northeast of the project site. To the northwest of the project site is undeveloped open space consisting primarily of coastal sage scrub. To the southwest, the project site is bordered by a mobile home park. The proposed project is visible from Highway 8 Business Loop and the Interstate 8 corridor. The Interstate 8 corridor is designated a Second Priority Scenic Route in the Scenic Highway Element of the San Diego County General Plan.

The proposed project site topography includes a hilltop and the majority of the site is on a southeast-facing slope. Elevation onsite ranges from approximately 612 feet above mean sea level at the southern portion of the site to approximately 740 feet above mean sea level. Current land uses onsite include a single family home and undeveloped land. Habitat onsite includes coastal sage scrub, non-native grassland and disturbed/developed land. The coastal sage scrub habitat occurs in the northwest portion of the property on the northwest facing slopes.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

| Permit Type/Action | Agency |
|--|---------------------|
| Tentative Map | County of San Diego |
| Rezone | County of San Diego |
| Site Plans | County of San Diego |
| Grading Permit | County of San Diego |
| Improvement Plans | County of San Diego |
| General Construction Stormwater Permit | RWQCB |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit | County of San Diego |
| National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit | RWQCB |
| Water District Approval | Helix Water District |
| Sewer District Approval | Lakeside Sanitation District |
| Fire District Approval | Lakeside Fire Protection District |

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Agricultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology & Soils</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Haz. Materials</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology & Water Quality</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use & Planning</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population & Housing</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation/Traffic</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities & Service Systems</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Signature

Larry Hofreiter
Printed Name

Date

10/26/09
Land Use/Environmental Planner
Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Based on a site visit completed by Larry Hofreiter on August 23, 2009, the proposed project is located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying landcover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends from Interstate 8 to the north and from the surrounding hilltops. The visual composition consists of vegetated rolling foothills, and commercial and residential development.

The proposed project is proposing to subdivide four (4) lots ranging in size from 7.19 acres to 4.72 acres for future residential development. One additional 2.09 acre lot is reserved for the 60 foot wide public street (Street "A"). Grading will consist of 218,000 cubic yards of cut and fill material. Cut slopes approximately 48 feet in height and retaining walls up to 5'4" in height are proposed. All of the graded slopes are over 15%. The proposed slopes would cover 25% of the project site.

A Visual Resources Report for the proposed project, dated August 2008, was prepared by REC Consultants. Based on the results of the visual resources analysis, the project has been determined to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons. First, the project site is located within a residential and commercially developed area and is surrounded by residential and commercial development to the south, east and west. Provision of additional residential development within an area already developed with residential uses would provide visual continuity with adjacent off-site uses. Second, the manufactured slopes would be hydroseeded pursuant to the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). Hydroseeding with native seed mixes would foster quicker re-growth (and therefore also

visual cover of cut areas), returning the disturbed slopes to a condition more consistent with abutting slopes more quickly than would reliance on natural re-growth. Therefore, minimizing visual breaks of vegetation and maintaining visual context for the project and surrounding hillside. Third, The RV-14.5 Zone will also include a "B" designator which will require a subsequent site plan to be evaluated for conformance with the Lakeside Community Design Guidelines. Any future development would be subject to further review to ensure future buildings would be designed to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding community.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the proposed projects identified are similar to existing development patterns in this area. These development patterns are in conformance with the County's adopted General Plan and are in accordance with the approved land uses within the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts on a scenic vista.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

A Visual Resources Report for the proposed project, dated August 2008, was prepared by REC Consultants. Based on the results of the visual resources analysis, the project is located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a potential state scenic highway. Interstate 8 is designated by the Lakeside Community Plan as a Second Priority Scenic Route. The preservation of the visual integrity of this corridor is recommended. Views from the highway include prominent knolls, vegetated riparian corridors and steep slopes covered with dense upland native vegetation and rocky outcroppings. The project may be viewed for short durations by motorists traveling along the highway corridor; however, existing vegetation, topography and structures

create blockages to the view onto the project site. Views of the project site while traveling east on Interstate 8 are approximately 14 seconds when traveling at the posted speed limit. Westbound travelers experience approximately the same view duration at the same speed.

The project is compatible with the Interstate 8 viewshed in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons. First, as stated above, views of the project site from Interstate 8 are brief and limited due to existing vegetation, topography and structures. Second, the manufactured slopes would be hydroseeded pursuant to the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). Hydroseeding with native seed mixes would foster quicker re-growth (and therefore also visual cover of cut areas), returning the disturbed slopes to a condition more consistent with abutting slopes more quickly than would reliance on natural re-growth. Therefore, minimizing visual breaks of vegetation and maintaining visual context for the project and surrounding hillside. Third, the RV-14.5 Zone will also include a "B" designator which will require a subsequent site to ensure future development is designed in accordance with the Lakeside Design Guidelines. The Lakeside Design Guidelines specify open space and planting requirements for front yards, interior yards and street trees for multi-family residential development projects.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the proposed projects identified are similar to existing development patterns in this area. These development patterns are in conformance with the County's adopted General Plan and are in accordance with the approved land uses within the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as as rolling foothills interrupted with

residential development near the highway and more continuous natural landscape in the distant portions of the viewshed.

A Visual Resources Report for the proposed project, dated August 2008, was prepared by REC Consultants. Based on the results of the visual resources analysis, the project has been determined to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality for the following reasons. First, the project site is located within a residential and commercially developed area and is surrounded by residential and commercial development to the south, east and west. Provision of additional residential development within an area already developed with residential uses would provide visual continuity with adjacent off-site uses. Second, the manufactured slopes would be hydroseeded pursuant to the Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). Hydroseeding with native seed mixes would foster quicker re-growth (and therefore also visual cover of cut areas), returning the disturbed slopes to a condition more consistent with abutting slopes more quickly than would reliance on natural re-growth. Therefore, minimizing visual breaks of vegetation and maintaining visual context for the project and surrounding hillside. Third, The RV-14.5 Zone will also include a "B" designator which will require a subsequent site plan for any future development to ensure future buildings would be designed to be compatible in scale and character with the surrounding.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVII are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the proposed projects identified are similar to existing development patterns in this area. These development patterns are in conformance with the County's adopted General Plan and are in accordance with the approved land uses within the surrounding area. Therefore, the project will not result in any adverse project or cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the Zone B lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting and searchlights.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Department of Planning and Land Use and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Prime Agricultural Soils. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by a DPLU Agricultural Specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse project or cumulative level impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use because the prime agricultural soil on-site comprises of approximately 1 acre at the southwest corner of the subject property. There is no active agriculture on the subject site or on any of the adjacent properties, nor is there evidence of any active agriculture in the recent past. Subsequently, the project is not converting farmland into a non-farmland use, nor does it impact surrounding active agriculture because it does not exist. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned RS4, which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site's land is not under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

- c) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site and surrounding area within a radius of 1 mile have land designated as Prime Farmland. As a result, the proposed project was reviewed by a DPLU Agricultural Specialist and was determined not to have significant adverse impacts related to the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use for the following reasons: The prime agricultural soil on-site comprises approximately 1 acre at the southwest corner of the subject property. There is no active agriculture on the subject site or on any of the adjacent properties, nor is there evidence of any active agriculture in the recent past. Subsequently, the project is not converting farmland into a non-farmland use, nor does it impact surrounding active agriculture because it does not exist. Therefore, no potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a Tentative Map and Rezone to develop 266 multi-family residential dwelling units on approximately 21.89 acres. As discussed in the Air Quality Study, dated August 28, 2008, prepared by Urban Crossroads on file with the Department of Planning and Land Use as Environmental Review Number 05-14-009, the Lakeside Subregional Area (SRA) consists of approximately 5,000 total multi-family dwelling units (2007) and in the year 2020 will increase to approximately 8,500. Therefore, approximately 3,500 additional units will need to be provided in the Lakeside SRA by 2020. The proposed project, along with reasonably foreseeable projects in the vicinity are expected to develop approximately 458 multi-family residential dwelling units. Since the proposed multi-family dwelling units do not exceed the planned growth projections for the area, the project conforms to the RAQS and SIP. Operation of the project will result in emissions of ozone precursors that were considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections. As such, the proposed project is not expected to conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below the screening levels, and subsequently will not violate ambient air quality.

- b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since APCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the use of the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project proposes a Tentative Map and Rezone to develop 266 multi-family residential dwelling units on approximately 21.89 acres. Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to County of San Diego Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions

from the construction phase would result in pollutant emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance with the proposed project design measures. These design measures include three daily applications of water on disturbed soils, covering haul vehicles, replanting disturbed areas as soon as possible, restricting vehicle speed to 15 mph or less to control vehicle dust. Other measures include the project design include keeping construction equipment well maintained to ensure proper timing and tuning of engines, equipment maintenance records and equipment design specification data sheets shall be kept on-site during construction activity, ensuring that equipment will not idle for more than 5 minutes, ensure use of low-sulfur diesel fuel in construction equipment and ensure that rough grading activity does not overlap with other phases of construction. With the implementation of these project design measures, the project would not exceed the Screening Level Thresholds (SLTs) for construction and would have a less than significant impact.

In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 2,128 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). The emissions associated with the operation of the project were analyzed in the Air Quality Study prepared by Urban Crossroads and determined to be less than significant. Operational emissions were modeled and included emissions from vehicle combustion, landscape maintenance, architectural coatings and fugitive dust related to vehicle travel and were determined to be below the SLTs for operational emissions; therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities, and also as the result of increase of traffic from project implementation. An Air Quality Study was prepared for the project to determine whether the project would have a significant effect on air quality. The study included a review of cumulative projects in close proximity to the proposed project's construction activities to determine whether the project would exceed the SLTs established by the County of San Diego Land Use Environmental Group (LUEG) Guidelines for Determining Significance for Air Quality. The study indicates that PM₁₀ concentrations decrease by 90 percent from the project boundary within 50 meters (165 feet) of the source. At 100 meters (330 feet) PM₁₀ concentrations decrease by 99 percent, beyond 100 meters concentrations approach zero. Therefore, no cumulative contribution of PM₁₀ beyond 150 meters would be physically possible. In addition, construction emissions are short-term in nature and typically settle out in close proximity to the source. In order for a cumulative impact to occur, the proposed project would have to be undergoing construction simultaneously with a project within 150 meters of the site. The likelihood of a cumulatively considerable contribution to PM₁₀ from the proposed project in conjunction with adjacent projects is highly unlikely due to the proximity of other cumulative projects to the Settlers Point project. The project also proposes design measures that would reduce construction emissions and cumulative considerable contributions of PM₁₀. These measures include the applying water three times a day during construction activities, covering haul vehicles, replanting disturbed areas as soon as practicable, maintaining construction equipment, ensuring construction equipment does not idle more than five minutes, and ensuring rough grading will not overlap with other phases of construction. Based upon the Air Quality Study prepared by Urban Crossroads, the project would have a less than significant cumulatively considerable impact.

Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to create a cumulatively considerable impact nor a considerable net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that

would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

The project is not near any schools, hospitals, resident day care facilities, or day-care centers. However, the project will introduce new residences into the project area. Based on the Air Quality Study prepared by Urban Crossroads, the project proposes to place residences within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by the SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of any identified point source of significant emissions. In evaluating sensitive receptors, the two primary emissions of concern are CO and diesel particulate matter. The study included a CO hotspot analysis by using information from the Settlers Point Traffic Impact Study. The traffic study indicates that none of the study-area intersections will result in a LOS E or worse and intersection volumes exceeding 3,000 peak hour trips. Thus, the project is not expected to result in a significant impact with regard to the creation of a CO hotspot. In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from vehicle and dust emissions during the construction and operation phase of the project. However, given the location of the project and the nature of the odors, these impacts are not expected to affect a substantial number of people for the following reasons: the construction emissions associated with the project would be temporary and would typically settle out in close proximity to the project site. As such, impacts as a result of odors generated by the proposed project will be less than significant. Moreover, the affects of objectionable odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable odor. A list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects create objectionable odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|---|

☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Biological Resources Report dated February 2006 prepared by Robin Church, and an updated project description submitted March 10, 2009 prepared by Elyssa K Robertson, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site supports sensitive vegetation, namely, coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland.

The 21.89 acre site is largely covered by non-native grassland (18.21 acres) but also includes 1.69 acres of coastal sage scrub and 1.99 acres of developed habitat. The site is in the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the MSCP, and the northwestern corner of the property is designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA), qualifying the site as a Biological Resource Core Area (BRCA). Although the California gnatcatcher has not been observed on-site, it has been observed on the adjacent property, and is assumed to occur on-site. One other sensitive species, the Cooper's hawk, was observed on-site.

Protocol surveys for the Quino checkerspot butterfly (*Euphydryas editha quino*) were conducted by Darren Smith (permit #TE-07628) from February 23 through April 17, 2005. The primary host plant, Dwarf plantain (*Plantago erecta*) was not observed on-site, and only two individuals of secondary host plant purple owl's clover (*Castilleja exserta*) were observed. The Quino checkerspot butterfly was not observed on-site and has a low potential to occur because the nearest siting was approximately 2 miles away in the City of Santee. The site was also assessed for potential to support Stephen's kangaroo rat (*Dipodomys stephensi*) and San Diego fairy shrimp (*Branchinecta sandiegoensis*) and found to have a low potential due to lack of suitable habitat. The burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugea*) has a low potential to occur since no burrows were observed on-site.

Eleven sensitive species have a high potential to occur on-site: the aforementioned California gnatcatcher (*Polioptila californica*), northern red-diamond rattlesnake (*Crotalus ruber ruber*), orange-throated whiptail (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*), San Diego banded gecko (*Coleonux variegatus abboti*), San Diego ringneck snake (*Diadophis punctatus similes*), silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*), Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*), southern grasshopper mouse (*Onychomys torridus Ramona*), black-shouldered kite (*Elanus caeruleus*), loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*), and turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*).

Habitat-based mitigation in conformance with the BMO will mitigate for impacts to California gnatcatcher, Cooper's hawk, and other sensitive species with a potential to occur on-site. Impacts to 2.16 acres of coastal sage scrub (including 0.47 acres off-site) will be mitigated at a 1.5:1 ratio with 3.24 acres of Tier I or II habitat in Crestridge

Mitigation Bank or another County-approved mitigation bank within the approved MSCP. Impacts to 20.04 acres of non-native grassland (including 1.83 acres off-site) will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio with 10.02 acres of Tier III habitat in Crestridge Mitigation Bank or another County-approved mitigation bank within the approved MSCP. In addition, all brushing, grading, and clearing within 300 feet of coastal sage scrub habitat will be conditioned to occur outside of the California gnatcatcher breeding season, March 1 to August 31. With these mitigation measures, the project will not result in substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, to any candidate, sensitive, or special status species and the impact is less than significant.

Moreover, the project has been found to comply with the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The MSCP was designed to compensate for the loss of biological resources throughout the program's region. As such, projects that conform to the MSCP, as specified in the Subarea Plan and BMO, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for those resources adequately covered by the program. Staff has prepared MSCP Findings demonstrating how TM 5423 will contribute to the goals of the MSCP. Other proposed projects in this ecoregion are also expected to meet the findings and goals of the County's MSCP and BMO. As such, the potential direct and indirect impacts discussed above would not be cumulatively considerable.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Biological Resources Report dated February 2006 prepared by Robin Church, and an updated project description submitted March 10, 2009 prepared by Elyssa K Robertson, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site supports sensitive habitat, namely, coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland.

The 21.89 acre site is largely covered by non-native grassland (18.21 acres) but also includes 1.69 acres of coastal sage scrub and 1.99 acres of developed habitat. The site is in the Metro-Lakeside-Jamul segment of the MSCP, and the property is designated as Pre-Approved Mitigation Area (PAMA). There is no riparian habitat on-site.

Habitat-based mitigation in conformance with the BMO will mitigate for impacts to coastal sage scrub and non-native grassland. Impacts to 2.16 acres of coastal sage

scrub (including 0.47 acres off-site) will be mitigated at a 1.5:1 ratio with 3.24 acres of Tier I or II habitat in Crestridge Mitigation Bank or another County-approved mitigation bank within the approved MSCP. Impacts to 20.04 acres of non-native grassland (including 1.83 acres off-site) will be mitigated at a 0.5:1 ratio with 10.02 acres of Tier III habitat in Crestridge Mitigation Bank or another County-approved mitigation bank within the approved MSCP. With these mitigation measures, project impacts to any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community identified in the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance, Natural Community Conservation Plan, Fish and Game Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional plans, policies or regulations will be less than significant.

Moreover, the project has been found to comply with the County's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The MSCP was designed to compensate for the loss of biological resources throughout the program's region. As such, projects that conform to the MSCP, as specified in the Subarea Plan and BMO, would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts for those resources adequately covered by the program. Staff has prepared MSCP Findings demonstrating how TM 5423 will contribute to the goals of the MSCP. Other proposed projects in this ecoregion are also expected to meet the findings and goals of the County's MSCP and BMO. As such, the potential direct and indirect impacts discussed above would not be cumulatively considerable.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Biological Resources Report dated February 2006 prepared by Robin Church, and an updated project description submitted March 10, 2009 prepared by Elyssa K Robertson, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, site photos, a Biological Resources Report dated February 2006 prepared by Robin Church, and an updated project description submitted March 10, 2009 prepared by Elyssa K Robertson, County staff biologist Beth Ehsan has determined that the site does not support wildlife corridors due to its surroundings of dense residential development in all directions. Wildlife could enter the property from the northwest corner, which connects to undeveloped habitat, but this entrance is largely blocked by the existing single-family home, and there is no outlet in any other direction. The established wildlife corridor in the area is the Lakeside Archipelago, which crosses the I-8 southwest of the project site. Therefore, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. In addition, although no specific native wildlife nursery sites have been identified onsite, the project will be conditioned to avoid grading or clearing during the California gnatcatcher breeding season.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated August 25, 2009 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego certified archaeologists, Tim Gross, Principal Archaeologist, Matt Sivba, Field Director, and project historian Steven R. Van Wormer on February 17, 2006, it has been determined that there is one historical resource within the project site. This resource is a Mediterranean style house, built between 1901 (not shown on the 1901 USGS map) and 1928, where the 1928 aerial photograph clearly shows the house. It is not associated with early pioneer families in the region. Evidence suggests that David and Cora Hutton built the house as a retirement home some time in the early to mid 1920's. The building is typical of the thousands of small to mid-sized Mediterranean style homes built throughout Southern California during this period.

An historical resources report titled, "*Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Settlers Point Property County of San Diego, California*", dated March 2006 prepared by G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis, evaluated the significance of the historical resources based on a review of historical records including 1901 USGS map of the area, the 1928 aerial photograph, chain of title and an architectural evaluation. Based on the results of this study, it has been determined that the historic resource is not significant pursuant to the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Section 15064.5. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant historic resources pursuant to CEQA Section 15064.5 loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego certified archaeologists G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis, it has been

determined that the project site does not appear to contain any archaeological resources. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Settlers Point Property County of San Diego, California*", dated March 2006 prepared by G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis, dated March 2006. The archaeological survey was conducted September 13, 2005.

The project is not expected to have an impact on prehistoric resources. However, because 16 archaeological and historic sites have been identified and recorded within one mile of the project site, the amount of proposed grading (218,000 cubic yards) and the fact that ground visibility was poor during both surveys, archaeological monitoring will be required during any construction grading.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County. The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features. Additionally, based on a site visit by Larry Hofreiter on August 23, 2009, no known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps indicates that the project is located entirely on plutonic igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains. A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is located on igneous rock and has no potential for producing fossil remains.

- e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property by a County of San Diego certified archaeologist, G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis,, it has been determined that the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not appear to include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report titled, "*Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Settlers Point Property County of San Diego, California*", dated March 2006 prepared by G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis, dated March 2006.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a staff geologist has reviewed the project and has concluded that no other substantial evidence of recent (Holocene) fault activity is present within the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|--|

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The geology of the project site is identified as Cretaceous Plutonic. This geologic environment is not susceptible to ground failure from seismic activity. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004). Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment

has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have no impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Fallbrook-Vista sandy loams, Vista coarse sandy loam, Ramona sandy loam, and Visalia sandy loam that has a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" and "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan, dated July 2009, prepared by REC Consultants. The plan includes the following Best Management Practices to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- c) Will the project produce unstable geological conditions that will result in adverse impacts resulting from landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project. On a site visit conducted by Larry Hofreiter on August 23, 2009, no geological formations or features were noted that would produce unstable geological conditions as a result of the project. For further information refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., i-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Fallbrook-Vista sandy loams, Vista coarse sandy loam, Ramona sandy loam, and Visalia sandy loam. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. A service availability letter dated March 23, 2005 has been received from the Lakeside Sanitation District indicating that the facility has adequate capacity for the projects wastewater disposal needs. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to demolish an existing single family residence on site that was constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP) and Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows and doors. Lead containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 CCR Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1) and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940's until the late 1970's in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the USEPA, CalEPA, and the CalOSHA. Demolition or renovation operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 361.140-361.156. In accordance with existing regulations, the project will be required to complete asbestos and lead surveys to determine the presence or absence of ACMs or LBP prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of onsite structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency

response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and

Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan will not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the County Consolidated Fire Code for the 17 Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County. Furthermore, an approved Fire Protection Plan has been prepared for the project dated August 28, 2008. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the Tentative Map or building permit process. Also, a Fire Service Availability Letter and conditions, dated February 23, 2005, have been received from the Lakeside Fire Protection District. The Fire Service Availability Letter indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be five (5) minutes. The Maximum Travel Time allowed pursuant to the County Public Facilities Element is 5 minutes. Therefore, based on the review of the project by County staff, through compliance with the County Consolidated Fire Code and through compliance with the Lakeside Fire Protection District's conditions, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the County Consolidated Fire Code.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's

exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit there are none of these uses on adjacent properties. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes a tentative map to merge and redraw parcel configuration to construct 266-units of residential units which requires a General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Storm Water Management Plan, approved July 2009, and a copy of their "Notice of Intent" submitted to the RWQCB, which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the "General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities." The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: The project design implemented Low Impact Development (LID) measures. Other BMPs incorporated include: Storm drain stenciling and signage, inlet filters, efficient irrigation systems, extended/dry detention basins with grass/vegetated lining, and vegetated slopes and swales. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

Finally, the project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements listed above ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable water quality impacts related to waste discharge because, through the permit, the project will conform to Countywide watershed standards in the JURMP and SUSMP, derived from State regulation to address human health and water quality concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact to water quality from waste discharges.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Coches 907.14 hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, July 2003, a portion of this watershed at the Pacific Ocean and mouth of the San Diego River is impaired for coliform bacteria. Constituents of concern in the San Dieguito watershed include coliform bacteria, total dissolved solids, nutrients, petroleum chemicals, toxics, and trash.

The project proposes the following activities that are associated with these pollutants: attached residential, detached residential and commercial. However, the project design implemented Low Impact Development (LID) measures. Other BMPs incorporated include: Storm drain stenciling and signage, inlet filters, efficient irrigation systems, extended/dry detention basins with grass/vegetated lining, and vegetated slopes and swales.

The proposed BMP's are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego, Incorporated Cities of San Diego County, and San Diego Unified Port District includes the following: Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted

runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Ordinance No. 9426 is Appendix A of Ordinance No. 9424 (WPO) and sets out in more detail, by project category, what Dischargers must do to comply with the Ordinance and to receive permits for projects and activities that are subject to the Ordinance. Collectively, these regulations establish standards for projects to follow which intend to improve water quality from headwaters to the deltas of each watershed in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Storm water Management Plan that details a project's pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region as outlined in Chapter 3 of the Water Quality Control Plan (Plan). The water quality objectives are necessary to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit as described in Chapter 2 of the Plan.

The project lies in the Coches 907.14 hydrologic subarea, within the San Diego hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, reservoirs and lakes, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply, industrial service supply; hydropower generation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; commercial and sport fishing; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; shellfish harvesting; and, rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat.

The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: Construction, grading, landscaping, and outdoor vehicle parking. However, the project design implemented Low Impact Development (LID) measures. Other BMPs incorporated include: Storm drain stenciling and signage, inlet filters, efficient irrigation systems, extended/dry detention basins with grass/vegetated lining, and vegetated slopes and swales. The above BMP's will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses.

In addition, the proposed BMP's are consistent with regional surface water, storm water and groundwater planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. Refer to Section VIII., Hydrology and Water Quality, Question b, for more information on regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Helix Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to subdivide 21.89 acres into four future residential development lots. The lots range in size from 3.96 to 7.20 acres and will ultimately include a total of 266 dwelling units. As outlined in the Storm water Management Plan (SWMP) prepared by REC Consultants, dated June 2009, the project

will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: silt fence, desilting basin, street sweeping and vacuuming, sandbag barrier, storm drain inlet protection, material delivery and storage, spill prevention and control, solid waste management, concrete waste management, stabilized construction entrance and exit, water conservation practices, dewatering operations, paving and grinding operations, vehicle and equipment maintenance, and slope protection. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. 2001-01), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The SWMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMP's that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff based on a Drainage Study prepared by REC Consultants on June 12, 2009:

1. Drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
2. The project will not increase water surface elevation in a watercourse with a watershed equal to or greater one square mile by 2/10 of a foot or more in height.
3. The project will not increase surface runoff exiting the project site equal to or greater than one cubic foot/second.

Therefore, the project will not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable alteration or a drainage pattern or increase in the rate or amount of runoff, because the project will not substantially increase water surface elevation or runoff exiting the site, as detailed above.

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose to create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. The project proposes to create four residential lots to be developed in the future. Measures to mitigate added flows will be implemented at full project development. The proposed temporary desilting/detention basins shall be replaced at full project development with permanent detention facilities, i.e. permanent dry/wet detention basins, underground detention system, infiltration trenches, etc. Existing downstream storm drain pipes at the intersection of Los Coches Road and Highway 8 Business will be required to be upsized.

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following potential sources of polluted runoff: Construction, grading, landscaping, and outdoor vehicle parking. However, the project design implemented Low Impact Development (LID) measures. Other BMPs incorporated include: Storm drain stenciling and signage, inlet filters, efficient irrigation systems, extended/dry detention basins with grass/vegetated lining, and vegetated slopes and swales. Therefore, potential pollutants will be reduced in runoff to the maximum extent practicable. Refer to VIII Hydrology and Water Quality Questions a, b, c, for further information.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact will occur.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations; therefore, no impact will occur.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

- l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

| | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property. Therefore, the project will not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Also, staff geologist has determined that the geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is subject to the Regional Land Use Element Policy 1.1 Current Urban Development Area (CUDA) and General Plan Land Use Designation (5 & 8) Residential. The General Plan designation 8 Residential permits no more than 14.5 dwelling units per acre on 19.64 acres, and the 5 Residential designation permits no more than 4.3 dwelling units per acre on 2.25 acres. The proposed project maintains these densities and no changes are proposed to the General Plan land use designations. The project is also consistent with the policies identified in the Lakeside Community Plan. Policy 2 of the Lakeside Community Plan reads: Confine higher density residential development to the areas that (a) have all necessary public facilities; (b) are within the existing sewer district; and (c) are adjacent to major roads and commercial areas. The entire project site is zoned RS-4, which carries a zone density of 4.3 du/acre and a 10,000 square foot lot size. The project is proposing to rezone 19.64 acres from RS-4 to RV 14.5 du/acre to be consistent with the existing General Plan land use designation.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Although the project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of undetermined mineral resources MRZ-3, a staff geologist has reviewed the site's geologic environment and has determined that the site is not located within an alluvial river valley or underlain by coastal marine/non-marine granular deposits. Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the residents of the state will occur as a result of this project. Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned RS-4, which is not considered to be an Extractive Use Zone (S-82) nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25) (County Land Use Element, 2000).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is a four (4) lot subdivision and will be occupied by residential use. Based the Noise Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads and dated December 18, 2007, the surrounding area is zoned residential and commercial. Incorporation of a Noise Protection Easement will ensure that the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed

the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards.

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Policy 4b addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of CNEL 60 dB(A), modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities where quiet is an important attribute. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads and dated December 18, 2007, exterior noise level will exceed the County of San Diego 60 dBA CNEL standard in portions of Lots 3 and 4 located 25 feet within the edges of the property line. The noise study provides a highly conservative noise assessment addressing the possibility of having future exterior noise sensitive receptors located within the 60 dBA CNEL contour line, to be mitigated by a 4 foot high wall running along the southeastern property lines of Lots 3 and 4. It has been determined that these areas exposed to future noise levels of 60 dBA CNEL are small portions of Lots 3 and 4 and are less than significant because no residences are proposed within these areas as part of the proposed project. Although a noise wall may not be necessary, the project will be conditioned to dedicate a noise protection easement on small portion of Lots 3 and 4 on the Final Map. This Final Map condition will ensure any future noise sensitive land uses will comply with County Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads and dated December 18, 2007, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned RS4 that has a one-hour nighttime average sound limit of 45dBA. The project's noise levels at the adjoining properties will not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-410

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads and dated December 18, 2007, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, It is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan (Noise Element, Policy 4b) and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively

considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Circulation Element (CE) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* 1995, Rudy Hendriks, *Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations* 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves the following permanent noise sources that may increase the ambient noise level: Vehicle traffic from nearby roadways

and typical residential activities. As indicated in the response listed under Section XI Noise, Question a., the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels based on review of the project by County staff and Noise Analysis prepared by Urban Crossroads dated December 18, 2007. Studies completed by the Organization of Industry Standards (ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747) state an increase of 10 dB is perceived as twice as loud and is perceived as a significant increase in the ambient noise level.

The project will not result in cumulatively noise impacts because a list of past, present and future projects within in the vicinity were evaluated. It was determined that the project in combination with a list of past, present and future project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to noise 10 dB CNEL over existing ambient noise levels. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not involve any uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity including but not limited to extractive industry; outdoor commercial or industrial uses that involve crushing, cutting, drilling, grinding, or blasting of raw materials; truck depots, transfer stations or delivery areas; or outdoor sound systems.

Also, general construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410), which are derived from State regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than an 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than significant: The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical changes that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area such as: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions. The project does propose a Zone Reclassification, however, the rezone would be consistent with the existing (and proposed) General Plan designation of 14.5 du/acre. Because community level population analysis and traffic analysis is based on build out of the General Plan Land

Use designations, the project would have a less than significant impact on population and housing because it is consistent with the County's long range planning documents.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The property has one single-family residence which is likely to be removed as a result of this project. However, removal of this residential development would not result in displacement of existing housing since it will generate a total of 266 single-family dwellings units. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Based on the service availability forms received for the project, the proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate existing services are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Lakeside Fire Protection, Lakeside Union School District, Cajon Valley Union School District, and Grossmont Union High School District. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable

service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, the project will not have an adverse physical effect on the environment because the project does not require new or significantly altered services or facilities to be constructed.

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that will create 266 dwelling units that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The proposed project opted to pay park fees. Therefore, the project meets the requirements set forth by the PLDO for adequate parkland dedication and thereby reducing impacts, including cumulative impacts to local recreational facilities. The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts, because all past, present and future residential projects are required to comply with the requirements of PLDO. Refer to XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

There is an existing surplus of County Regional Parks. Currently, there is over 21,765 acres of regional parkland owned by the County, which far exceeds the General Plan standard of 15 acres per 1,000 population. In addition, there are over one million acres of publicly owned land in San Diego County dedicated to parks or open space including Federal lands, State Parks, special districts, and regional river parks. Due to the extensive surplus of existing publicly owned lands that can be used for recreation the project will not result in substantial physical deterioration of regional recreational facilities or accelerate the deterioration of regional parkland. Moreover, the project will not result any cumulatively considerable deterioration or accelerated deterioration of regional recreation facilities because even with all past, present and future residential projects a significant surplus of regional recreational facilities will remain.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project will have potentially significant direct traffic impacts that require mitigation. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), prepared by Linscott, Law, and Greenspan, dated May 6, 2009, has been completed. The TIA identified direct impacts to the following road segments and/or intersections:

- Highway 8 Business from Los Coches Road to the Project Driveway (Street "A")

The TIA proposes the following mitigation measures that will reduce the potentially significant impacts to a level less than significant:

- Provide a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane and a dedicated westbound right turn lane on Highway 8 Business at the project driveway (Street "A").
- Widen the north side of Highway 8 Business along the project frontage to County of San Diego Standards for a Public Major Road (plus bike lane).
- Provide a northbound right-turn overlap phase at the Los Coches Road and Highway 8 Business intersection.

These mitigation measures have been made conditions of project approval. Also refer to the answer for XV. b. below.

- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency and/or as identified by the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program for designated roads or highways?

| | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. This program includes the adoption of a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) program to fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from future development. Based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts, the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model was utilized to analyze projected build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing circulation element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Based on the results of the traffic modeling, funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from new development was identified. Existing roadway deficiencies will be corrected through improvement projects funded by other public funding sources, such as TransNet, gas tax, and grants. Potential cumulative impacts to the region's freeways have been addressed in SANDAG's Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). This plan, which considers freeway buildout over the next 30 years, will use funds from TransNet, State, and Federal funding to improve freeways to projected level of service objectives in the RTP.

The proposed project generates 2128 ADT. These trips will be distributed on circulation element roadways in the County that were analyzed by the TIF program, some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. These project trips therefore contribute to a potential significant cumulative impact and mitigation is required. The potential growth represented by this project was included in the growth projections upon which the TIF program is based. Therefore, payment of the TIF, which will be required at issuance of building permits, in combination with other components of the program described above, will mitigate potential cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant.

The project will have potentially significant cumulative traffic impacts that require mitigation. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), prepared by Linscott, Law, and Greenspan, dated May 6, 2009, has been completed. The TIA identified cumulative impacts to the following road segments and/or intersections:

- Los Coches Road from Woodside Avenue to Wellington Hill Drive.
- Los Coches Road from Wellington Hills Drive to Highway 8 Business.
- Highway 8 Business from the project driveway (Street "A") to Pepper Drive.
- Los Coches Road and Highway 8 Business Intersection.

The TIA proposes the following mitigation measures that will reduce the potentially significant impacts to a level less than significant:

- Payment into the County's TIF Program.

These mitigation measures have been made conditions of project approval.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located outside of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport; therefore, the project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will not significantly alter traffic safety on Highway 8 Business. A safe and adequate sight distance shall be required at all driveways and intersections to the satisfaction of the Director of the Department of Public Works. All road improvements will be constructed according to the County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. The proposed project will not place incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment) on existing roadways. Therefore, the proposed

project will not significantly increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The Lakeside Fire Department has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that there is adequate emergency fire access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The Zoning Ordinance Section 6766 Parking Schedule requires provision for on-site parking spaces and the Lakeside Community Plan currently requires 2.1 parking spaces per unit for all multi-family residential development. Pursuant to the "B" Special Area Zone Designator, any future development would need to prepare a site plan and demonstrate conformance with parking requirements identified in both the County Zoning Ordinance and the Lakeside Design Guidelines; therefore, the project will not result in insufficient parking capacity.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant: The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain existing conditions as it relates to pedestrians and bicyclists.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact:

The project proposes to discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from Lakeside Sanitation District that indicates the district will serve the project. Therefore, because the project will be discharging wastewater to a RWQCB permitted community sewer system, the project is consistent with the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB, including the Regional Basin Plan.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not include new or expanded water or wastewater treatment facilities. In addition, the project does not require the construction or a substantial expansion of water or wastewater treatment facilities. Service availability forms have been provided which indicate adequate water and wastewater treatment facilities are available to the project from the following agencies/districts: Helix Water District and the Lakeside Sanitation District. Therefore, the project will not require any construction of new or expanded facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. The new facilities include yard drain systems to catch runoff from landscaped areas and a storm drain system to convey runoff to the existing facilities downstream from the site. Refer to the Storm water Management Plan, dated June 2009, for more information. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form Section I-XVII, the new facilities will not result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Specifically, refer to Sections VIII and XVI for more information.

- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires water service from the Helix Water District. A Service Availability Letter from the Helix Water District has been provided, indicating adequate water resources and entitlements are available to serve the requested water resources. Therefore, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project.

- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project requires wastewater service from the Lakeside Sanitation District. A Service Availability Letter from the Lakeside Sanitation District has been provided, indicating adequate wastewater service capacity is available to serve the requested demand. Therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment provider's service capacity.

- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

| | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|--|

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore, will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as significant would be potentially impacted by the project. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☒ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

| PROJECT NAME | PERMIT/MAP NUMBER |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| #10101 B Mountain View – AT&T | MUP 03-135 |
| East County Square Site Plan | SP 99-025 |
| Williams | TPM 20002 |
| Lasen | TPM 20361 |
| Priest | TPM 20305 |
| JBR Inc. | TPM 20569 |
| Blossom Valley Mini Storage | SP 04-009 |
| Sundial Investments | SP 00-066 |
| Los Coches Development | TM 5306 |
| Peacock Hill Apartments | REZ 03-013 |
| Highway Los Coches | REZ 06-009 |
| Denny's Lakeside | SP MOD / DEV 98-001-02 |

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Antonio | TPM 21030 |
| Cox | TPM 20337 |
| Big "O" Tires | SP 04-039 |
| Cox | GPA 05-002 |
| Peacock Hill Apartments | REZ 05-002 |
| Wintergardens | MUP 05-006 |
| Schreiber TPM | TPM 21169 |
| Diaz Day Care | MUP 07-015 |
| Pennings | TPM 21139 |
| Sky Rim Tank | MUP 06-080 |
| Mellco | REZ 08-003 |
| Walmart | MUP (minor) 94-005-11 |
| Los Coches | TPM 21033 |

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVI of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Transportation/Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these cumulative effects to a level below significance. This mitigation includes payment into the TIF Program. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, VIII Hydrology and Water Quality XI. Noise, XII. Population and Housing, and XV. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following Transportation/Traffic. The TIA identified direct impacts to the following road segments and/or intersections:

- Highway 8 Business from Los Coches Road to the Project Driveway (Street "A")

The TIA proposes the following mitigation measures that will reduce the potentially significant impacts to a level less than significant:

- Provide a dedicated eastbound left-turn lane and a dedicated westbound right turn lane on Highway 8 Business at the project driveway (Street "A").
- Widen the north side of Highway 8 Business along the project frontage to County of San Diego Standards for a Public Major Road (plus bike lane).
- Provide a northbound right-turn overlap phase at the Los Coches Road and Highway 8 Business intersection.

These mitigation measures have been made conditions of project approval. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

Visual Analysis Letter Report for Settler's Point, REC Consultants, dated August 2009

Air Quality Study, Urban Crossroads, dated August 28, 2008

Biological Resources Report and Updated Project Description, REC Consultants, dated July 2008

Cultural Resource Evaluation of the Settlers Point Property County of San Diego, California, prepared by G. Timothy Gross, Principal Archaeologist, and Matt Sivba with Affinis, dated March 2006

Fire Protection Plan, dated August 28, 2008

Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), REC Consultants, dated July 2009

Drainage Study, REC Consultants, June 12, 2009

Noise Analysis, Urban Crossroads, dated December 18, 2007

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), Linscott, Law, and Greenspan, dated May 6, 2009

Conceptual Sewer Capacity Study and Feasibility, REC Consultants, Dated August 2008

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.

(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 6700-6799; 6900-6910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan, Scenic Highway Element VI and Scenic Highway Program. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPiP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legisregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org)

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFG and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Consolidated Fire Code Health and Safety Code §13869.7, including Ordinances of the 17 Fire Protection Districts as Ratified by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, First Edition, October 17, 2001 and Amendments to the Fire Code portion of the State Building Standards Code, 1998 Edition.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health Community Health Division Vector Surveillance and

- Control. Annual Report for Calendar Year 2002. March 2003. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 5, CH. 3, Section 35.39100.030, Wildland/Urban Interface Ordinance, Ord. No.9111, 2000. (www.amlegal.com)
- Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act as amended October 30, 2000, US Code, Title 42, Chapter 68, § 5121, et seq. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Emergency Plan, March 2000.
- Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Operational Area Energy Shortage Response Plan, June 1995.
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)
- HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE & PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California General Plan Glossary of Terms, 2001. (ceres.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted and amended from September 29, 1971 to April 5, 2000. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) by Michael H. Remy, Tina A. Thomas, James G. Moore, and Whitman F. Manley, Point Arena, CA: Solano Press Books, 1999. (ceres.ca.gov)

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2003. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Part VIII, Noise Element, effective December 17, 1980. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Association of Governments, Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Borrego Valley Airport (1986), Brown Field (1995), Fallbrook Community Airpark (1991), Gillespie Field (1989), McClellan-Palomar Airport (1994). (www.sandag.org)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization
Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource
Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the
San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation
Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace,
Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for
Highway Projects.